

MICHIGAN
STATE
UNIVERSITY

Department of

COMMUNICATION

College of Communication Arts

OP #175

CIVIL DEFENSE BELIEF PATTERNS:

(VI) Change in Beliefs

Part B

by

Malcolm S. MacLean, Jr.
Thomas Danbury
Albert D. Talbott
Robert O. Engbretson

AD 600989

CIVIL DEFENSE BELIEF PATTERNS:

(VI) Change in Beliefs

Part B

Malcolm S. MacLean, Jr.
Thomas Danbury
Albert D. Talbott
Robert O. Engbretson

Department of Communication
College of Communication Arts
Michigan State University

Communication Research Report
November, 1963

Prepared for:
Office of Civil Defense
Department of Defense
Contract #: OCD-OS-62-19

This report has been reviewed in the Office of Civil Defense and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Office of Civil Defense.

Qualified requestors may obtain copies of this report from DDC.

CIVIL DEFENSE BELIEF PATTERNS

PREFACE

WHAT THIS SERIES OF REPORTS IS ABOUT

This series of reports deals with distinctive patterns of belief about fallout shelters and radiation, peace and defense, with the trusting of sources, with people's interests in various kinds of civil defense topics, and with changes in these various patterns over time.

We have taken one of two major approaches to psychological analysis. Some workers study traits, how much of a particular characteristic do how many people have. Instead, we have used type psychology, the parsimonious description of persons in terms of major patterns of belief. Readers interested in type methodology should read William Stephenson's The Study of Behavior.

Rokeach, in the Open and Closed Mind, suggests a model of beliefs which might best be described in concentric rings. At the core, we have beliefs so fundamental that their destruction would disintegrate the self. Then we have beliefs and disbeliefs in authorities. Then we have beliefs and disbeliefs in the ideas that these authorities express. Some of us are more rigid and dogmatic than others in defending our belief systems, including our beliefs in authorities.

During December, 1961, in each of five cities -- Boston, Lansing, Minneapolis, Oklahoma City, and Santa Monica-- we interviewed about 30 persons, 149 altogether. We chose them on the basis of their responses to a telephone survey directed by Dr. David K. Berlo. We maximized differences among persons in terms of their estimates of the likelihood and nearness of war, the chances it might effect them and possibilities of protecting themselves. Ours is a purposive sample of persons, not a random or representative sample.

In these interviews, we collected information about the belief patterns of people in three areas: fallout shelters and radiation, trust and distrust accorded people who might say something about them, and general orientations toward peace and defense which buttress these beliefs.

To accomplish this, we used Stephenson's Q methodology. A brief summary of the major steps in a Q study will be found at the end of this preface. Also, a separate report entitled Technical Summary is available summarizing in detail the various procedures used in collecting, processing, and analyzing the data.

In May, 1962, we sent all 149 persons who were interviewed in December a copy of the Government's pamphlet entitled "Fallout Protection."

One month later, in June, 1962, we re-interviewed all we could reach of the persons who had participated in the December phase of the study. In all, 105 of the original 149 were re-interviewed. Again, we collected information on patterns of fallout shelter and radiation beliefs and peace and defense beliefs. In addition, we investigated a new area--people's interest in various kinds of civil defense topics, ones that might appear in print. We

II

also asked the people about exposure to civil defense information, how the world situation was changing, "Fallout Protection" bulletin readership, use of the mass media and other things of a demographic or biographic nature such as age, education, income, etc.

Our purpose in re-interviewing was to get at various aspects of change and stability in the predominant belief patterns associated with fallout shelters and radiation and peace and defense over a six month period.

Our prime interest was in the relationship of such changes to exposure to information about civil defense, readership of the "Fallout Protection" bulletin, perceptions of changing world conditions, media use and other characteristics of the respondents.

In this series, Civil Defense Belief Patterns, there are included seven reports on the substantive findings of this program of research. They are:

Fallout Shelters and Radiation

Description and tabular summary of the four major types of persons on the basis of their patterns of belief about fallout shelters and radiation.

Source Credibility

Description and tabular summary of the five major types of persons on the basis of their patterns of trust and distrust accorded sources of information about fallout shelters and radiation.

Topic Appeals

Description and tabular summary of the five major types of persons on the basis of their patterns of interest in civil defense information topics.

Peace and Defense

Description and tabular summary of the five major types of persons on the basis of their patterns of belief about peace and defense.

Change in Belief

Description and tabular summary of the changes in major types of belief patterns about fallout shelters and radiation and peace and defense. Includes a summary of the relationships between belief pattern changes and various indices including civil defense information and media exposure, "Fallout Protection" bulletin readership, and general demographic characteristics.

Summary

General and overall summary of the program of research on civil defense belief patterns.

Technical Summary

Detailed summary of the various procedures used in collecting, processing and analyzing the data. This report primarily intended for the reader with a more technical bent who is either interested in the specific technical procedures we used or is interested in conducting a similar program of research.

III

Major Steps in Q Analysis

1. Respondents are asked to sort a deck of cards which have items printed on them into a specific number of ranked piles according to a modified normal distribution. The sorting is done on the basis of some criterion, e.g., belief-disbelief, agree-disagree, etc.
2. A matrix of intercorrelations is formed by correlating every person's sort of items with every other person's sort of items.
3. This matrix of intercorrelations is submitted to factor analysis so that persons are variables and items are observations. A principal axis solution is obtained. This is submitted to a varimax rotation which produces orthogonal factors. On this basis, a factor represents a grouping of persons around a common pattern of sorting the items. Hence, a factor represents a type of person.
4. Each pattern of sorting the items associated with each factor or type of person is estimated. This is done by weighting each item response of each of the persons most highly associated with a given factor by the degree to which they are loaded on that factor. The higher a person's loading on the factor, the greater is the weight. These weighted responses are summed across each item separately. This produces an item array of weighted responses for each factor in the rotated factor analysis solution selected. The arrays of weighted responses are then converted to z-scores.
5. The arrays of item z-scores are ordered from most accepted to most rejected for each factor. This provides a hierarchy of item acceptance for each factor or type of persons.
6. The arrays of items z-scores for each factor are compared by subtraction for each pair of factors. This produces arrays of difference scores for each pair of factors. This provides the basis for differentiating one factor or type of persons from another.

CHANGE IN BELIEFS

B. Overall Patterns of Change

In previous reports in this series, belief patterns about fallout shelters and radiation and peace and defense have been examined. The data for the previous analysis were gathered in December 1961 in five U.S. cities. Six months later these belief patterns were re-examined on 105 of the original 149 respondents.

This report will deal with an analysis of changes in belief patterns between December 1961 and June 1962 taking into account all the people for which we have the two sets of data.

Our first report on changes dealt with an analysis of changes for only those people who changed the most in the six-month period.

→ This report contains five major parts with an accompanying appendix for each part:

(I) Changes in the Rankings of the Fallout Shelter Statements and Their Relationship to the Demographic and General Information Exposure Indices;

II. Correlates of Stability of Individual Belief Patterns;

III. Changes in the Belief Patterns of the Four Fallout Shelter and Radiation Types;

IV. Changes in Belief Patterns of the Five Peace and Defense Types;

V. Booklet Readership.

VI. Summary

The people for this analysis were selected on the basis of their responses to a telephone survey conducted by Dr. David K. Berlo. We maximized differences among persons in terms of their estimates of the likelihood and nearness of war, the chances it might affect them and possibilities of protecting themselves. As such, ours is a purposive sample of persons, not a random or representative sample. Hence, the data reported are intended to be representative of only the people we interviewed and not of all the people of the United States or any other large sub-group. The intent of this report is primarily a description of the largest changes which occurred among the people we interviewed twice.

I. CHANGES IN THE RANKINGS OF THE FALLOUT SHELTER STATEMENTS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE DEMOGRAPHIC AND GENERAL INFORMATION EXPOSURE INDICES*

We constructed a series of statements representing a variety of orientations and beliefs about fallout shelters and radiation. Respondents in the five cities were asked to evaluate these statements. They sorted the 57 statements into 13 ranks from those with which they most agreed, believed, or thought were true to those with which they most disagreed, disbelieved, or thought were false. We asked them to do this twice, the first time was December 1961 and the second was June 1962. This section examines the relationship between changes in the rankings of these statements and various demographic and general information exposure indices. (A listing of these indices will be found in the Technical Appendix.)

For purposes of analysis, the 57 statements on fallout shelters and radiation were grouped into nine categories. These categories represent beliefs or attitudes toward: 1) perceived government confusion on civil defense, 2) community vs private shelters, 3) active or passive concern for civil defense matters, 4) civil defense is the government's responsibility, 5) pessimism-optimism on civil defense matters, 6) religious fatalism, 7) shelter acceptance, and 8) information gain on civil defense matters. There were eight statements which were not categorized or used in the following analysis. (For a listing of the specific statements in each category, see Section 1B, Appendix B of Change in Belief Patterns, Part A.)

Specifically, we examine the average change in ranks specifically for each of the eight statement content categories for the 105 people who participated in both the 1961 and the 1962 interviews. The emphasis is in terms of the relationship of these changes to the various demographic and general information exposure indices.

There was very little change in any of the eight categories when the shift in rank was averaged over all 105 people. The only places where changes worth noting occur are within various subgroupings of people produced by the demographic and general information exposure indices.

Perceived Government Confusion on Civil Defense Matters.-- Very little change occurred in the perception of the government's confusion on civil defense matters for any of the various kinds of people. People who talked to others about civil defense shift toward thinking the government was less confused in these areas whereas people who had talked to no one shifted slightly in the other direction.

Community vs Private Shelters.-- In this area, there were a couple of changes worth looking at. People who most perceived the world situation as a changing one, shift toward favoring community shelters over private ones. The reverse tendency was noted for the people who least perceived the world situation

* Tables of the data summarized in this section will be found in Appendix A.

as a changing one. The people who listened to the radio the most number of hours in the week previous to the 1962 interview became more favorable toward community shelters. Moderate radio users became more favorable toward private shelters. Light or non-users of the radio essentially did not change their position.

Active-Passive Concern for Civil Defense Matters.-- What kinds of people are becoming more active or passive in their concern for civil defense matters? Although the shift was not great, there appears to be a tendency for most of the people to be a little more passive in their concern for civil defense questions. This shift is a little more pronounced for people who have lived in the same place for longer periods of time and for those who attend church more.

When it comes to having noticed something in magazines about civil defense or not noticed something in the few months prior to the '62 interview, there were no overall differences. However, if you look at changes taking into account whether the person was more or less actively concerned at the time of the first interview, you get some interesting differences. For the people most actively concerned initially, the shift toward less active concern is greater for the ones that did notice something in magazines about civil defense than for those who did not. For the people initially most passively concerned, the shift toward more active concern is larger for those who noticed something in magazines than for those who did not.

Civil Defense is Government's Responsibility.-- People with no children at home and those who attended no organizational meetings in the month prior to the interview agreed less with the proposition that civil defense is government's responsibility in '62 than in '61. But, those with children at home and those who had attended meetings agreed more with this proposition by June 1962.

Pessimism-Optimism on Civil Defense Matters.-- Are some of the people we interviewed becoming optimistic or pessimistic about the utility and advisability of building shelters as a means of surviving a nuclear attack? The biggest changes occurred among the people who noticed something on TV about civil defense or fallout shelters and among those talked about either of these things with others. The shift was toward greater pessimism. The people who did neither of these things shifted slightly toward a more optimistic view. Also, people who attended some meetings got a little more optimistic whereas those who did not attend any meetings got a little more pessimistic. Another interesting aspect of these changes can be noted. In all three cases, if we look at the shifts depending on whether people were initially optimistic or pessimistic, we find the shifts in either direction greater for the more active groups (saw TV messages, talked to people, attended meetings) than for the less active ones.

Religious Fatalism.-- The extreme of religious fatalism and civil defense can be summed up by the following: "My fate is in the hands of God. There is no use building fallout shelters or anything like that, since what God wills will be done." A number of groups shifted their view in this respect. People who

found themselves in communication situations involving civil defense shifted toward a less religious fatalistic view with those who did not find themselves in such situations shifting slightly in the opposite direction. These communication situations included noticing things in magazines and newspapers and on TV about civil defense or fallout shelters and instances where information was obtained from sources other than the mass media. Also book readers shifted toward less fatalism and non-book readers doing the opposite. People who saw the world situation as a changing one also took a less fatalistic view.

Other groups showing somewhat less religious fatalism in their views included the under 49 age group, those with children living at home, and those who watched from 5 to 12 hours of TV the week before the interview. The comparable groups showing shifts toward greater fatalism were the over 49 age group, those with no children living at home and the heavy TV viewers. Shifts for the very light TV viewers were too small to indicate any tendency.

Shelter Acceptance.-- All of the shifts toward either greater or less acceptance of the general notion of fallout shelters were small. However, a few of the larger of these shifts will be noted. People who did not see a great deal of change in the world situation and those who are book readers accept shelters somewhat more while their counterparts rejected shelters somewhat more. In terms of broadcast media use in the week prior to the interview, light to moderate users of both radio and TV became more accepting of shelters whereas the heavy users (over 10 hours for the week) became less accepting.

There were no overall differences between those who had gotten additional information about civil defense and those who had not and between those with children at home and those with none. However, again we get some differences when we take into account initial position. Among those who did not obtain additional information and those with no children at home, there was almost no change no matter what the initial position was in terms of acceptance of fallout shelters. However, there were some shifts among both of the counterpart groups (those who got information and those with children at home) depending on what their initial position was. Those who were initially less favorable got more favorable, and those who were initially more favorable got less favorable.

Information Gain.-- In the shelter statements we asked people to evaluate there were 15 statements which were essentially factual in nature about fallout shelters and nuclear attack. Information gain was defined as the greater acceptance of true statements and the greater rejection of false statements. Most of the factual statements were taken from the "Fallout Protection" booklet.

Over all our respondents, there was a very slight information gain. Some of the larger shifts in information gain or loss will be noted. Among people who had not seen anything about civil defense, on TV there was some information gain; among those who had, there was some information loss. Information gain was larger for those who had attended meetings than those who had not. People with children at home increased in information while those with none at home decreased slightly. In terms of age, the younger and older age groups shifted toward an information gain with the middle group--36 to 49--had a slight in-

formation loss. In terms of broadcast media use, the light and heavy radio users had a greater gain in information than did the moderate users (3 to 9 hours of radio use and 5 to 12 hours of TV use in the week before the 1962 interview).

Summary.-- In overall tendencies, our respondents were a little less actively concerned about civil defense matters and are, on the whole, a little bit better informed about civil defense, at the end of the six month period than they were at the beginning. Most of the shifts in most of the shelter statement content categories for most of the sub-groups of people were small. This suggests, on the whole, stability of the belief patterns.

Where changes do occur, a number of the instances involve the more active sub-groupings, e.g., those who saw things about civil defense, attended meetings, read books, etc. From the point of view of developing communication strategies for civil defense questions, a number of these changes can be easily interpreted as either desirable or undesirable when there are differences between sub-groups of people.

However, not all of the differences noted were between sub-groups. Some were within sub-groups. That is, there were some instances where changes for people involved in communication situations on civil defense questions were larger than those for the people not so involved. But, these changes were of the order: undesirable positions were being changed to desirable ones and-- at the same time-- desirable positions were being changed to undesirable ones within the more active sub-groups with essentially no change of position in these terms within the less active sub-groups.

From one point of view at least, the apparent over-all "no change" for the sub-groups may be misleading. In developing communication strategies, one should be aware of the possibility of this kind of change. Also, decisions should be made as to whether communication involving this kind of change is as desirable as no communication at all. In some instances, it is conceivable that no communication at all is a more desirable alternative. For example, suppose that the people whose desirable position was changed to an undesirable one were much more likely to relay messages they received to others than were the others whose changes were in the other direction.

II. CORRELATES OF STABILITY OF INDIVIDUAL BELIEF PATTERNS*

Another way to examine change is to note what demographic and general information exposure indices are related to the degree to which the people did sort the statements in the same way for both interviews. Also, we asked them whether or not they thought they had sorted the cards in much the same way on the two occasions. Then, the relationship between this and the other indices can be examined.

Fallout Shelters and Radiation

Degree to Which People Did Sort the Statements in the Same Way.-- Three relationships were noted in this respect. The higher the education and the greater the number of books read in the month prior to the interview, the greater was the likelihood of sorting the shelter statements in the same way. Also, people who had talked to someone about civil defense in the few months prior to the interview were more stable than those who had not talked.

Perceived Stability of Sorting the Statements.-- The more a person thought he had sorted the cards in the same way, the more likely he was to have read the civil defense booklet: "Fallout Protection." Also, the greater the perceived stability, the more likely he was to have read at least one book in the month previous to the interview.

In seven of the eight statement content categories, we find that more of the people who thought they had changed did change than did the people who said they had not changed. The largest changes for the people who thought they had sorted the statement differently were an information gain, a shift toward thinking the government was more confused about civil defense policy, taking a less active concern for civil defense matters, and accepting less the proposition that civil defense is the government's responsibility. In all seven categories, the overall changes of the group who said they had not sorted them differently were very small. The only exception to this was in the category reflecting shelter acceptance. Changes were highest for the group who perceived themselves as stable. They became more accepting of shelters while the other group (self-designated changers) became less accepting. There was another group who didn't know if they had changed or not. No particular tendencies were noted for this group. However, no relationship between the perceived change and the stability of actually sorting the statements was detected. This was due probably to the fact that there was the sizable group (about a fourth of them) who could not make up their minds whether they had changed or not.

Peace and Defense

Degree to Which People Did Sort the Statements in the Same Way.-- The younger the person, the more likely he was to have sorted the peace and defense statements in the same way. As with the shelter beliefs, the more the education,

*Tables of the data summarized in this section will be found in Appendix B.

the more stable the sorting. Again, the people who had talked to someone about civil defense in the few months prior to the interview were more stable than those who had not talked.

Perceived Stability,-- No relationships between perceived stability of sorting the cards with any of the general information exposure and demographic indices were detected. Again, we could not detect any relationship between perceived stability and the stability of the actual two sorts. Again, this is probably due to the group who did not know if they had changed or not.

One final note: There did not appear to be any relationship between the perceived changes in the two sorts. However, there was a relationship between the actual change in sorting the fallout shelter statements and the actual change in sorting the peace and defense statements. The greater the stability of sorting the one, the greater the stability in the other.

III. CHANGES IN THE BELIEF PATTERNS OF THE FOUR FALLOUT SHELTER AND RADIATION TYPES.*

To get an estimate of the amount of change in the belief patterns of the four fallout shelter and radiation types, we recomputed the belief patterns again using the same procedures used for the first sort except we used the data from the second sort. However, we did this for only the subjects who took the sort twice. Then, we compared the two belief patterns for both times using the eight statement categories. Also, we assigned each person to one of the four types by comparing his actual sorts with the typical belief patterns. For both the 1961 and the 1962 sorts, a person was assigned to the type he was most like. If he was not like any of the types, he was left unassigned.

Fallout Shelter and Radiation Type A.-- The belief patterns for Type A were highly stable for both times (correlation .971). Type A did not change in any of the eight statement categories which are worth reporting. Of the original 64 type A's, 54 remained type A, while 7 became type D, and one each became type B, C, and not assigned.

Fallout Shelter and Radiation Type B.-- Again the two belief patterns were stable (correlation .880). Changes in the eight statement content categories were minor and not worth comment. Of the original 15 Type B's, 9 remained assigned to B, while two became A's, and three became D's, and one could no longer be assigned to one of the types. Type B's were generally unfavorable toward fallout shelters while A's and D's were more favorable. This possibly suggests that the change in people's orientation which did occur was toward more favorable attitudes toward shelters.

Fallout Shelter and Radiation Type C.-- Again, the belief patterns were rather stable for this type (correlation .734). Type C did not change in any of the statement categories very much. Of the 11 original Type C's, five remained Type C, with 4 becoming Type A, and one each to Type D and one not assigned. Again, there is the suggestion that what changes in orientation of people did occur were in the direction of greater favorability of attitudes toward shelters. Type C was not very favorable toward shelters, but Types A and D were.

Fallout Shelter and Radiation Type D.-- We obtain a somewhat less stable pattern of beliefs for Type D (correlation .704). It still cannot be characterized as very unstable. The principal change in the pattern came in the optimism toward civil defense matters, it got greater. Of the ten original Type D's, 7 became more like Type A, one more like B, and one unassignable. Only one person remained most like D.

One final note: if we look at the degree to which everyone is like each of the four types in December 1961, and the degree to which he is like each of the four types in June 1962, we find more evidence for stability of the belief patterns. The best single predictor of the degree to which a person is like one of the types in June 1962 is the degree to which he is like the type in December 1961.

*For a brief review of the four types, see page 10 of Change in Belief Patterns, Part A. Tables of the data summarized in this section will be found in Appendix C.

IV. CHANGES IN THE BELIEF PATTERNS OF THE FIVE PEACE AND DEFENSE TYPES*

To get an estimate of the amount of change in the belief patterns of the five peace and defense types, we ran the same kind of analysis as we did for the fallout shelter and radiation types. This time, we find four rather stable patterns and one unstable one.

Peace and Defense Type A.-- The belief patterns of this type were rather unstable (correlation .217). The instability was reflected in changes in five major areas. More concern is expressed for the after-effects of nuclear war and the disturbing nature of cold war problems. This is further reflected in a greater desire to have someone solve them. Also, there was the tendency to be less favorable toward both military and civil preparedness for war, and to be somewhat less trusting of government leaders to handle crises and civil defense matters. Of the 14 original Type A's, 7 remained A. Three became B's and 4 more like Type D.

Peace and Defense Type B.-- The belief patterns were highly stable (correlation .964). Changes were negligible. Of the original 48 B's, 33 remained unchanged. Nine people became more like D, 4 like A, and one each more like C and E.

Peace and Defense Type C.-- Again, we have another stable belief pattern (correlation .876). The only change worth noting was a shift toward showing less trust in government leaders in time of crisis and in civil defense matters. There were originally 22 people most like Type D. Eleven remained most like Type D. Seven shifted to be more like Type B, 2 shifted to Type A, and one became unassignable.

Peace and Defense Type E.-- Again, another stable typical belief pattern (correlation .771). The principal change in the pattern was a shift toward a less favorable attitude toward pre-emptive attacks. Of the ten original Type E's, 2 remained unchanged in assignment, 6 became B, one became A, and one was not assignable.

One final note: as with the shelter patterns--the best single predictor of the degree to which a person is like one of the types in June 1962 is the degree to which he is like the type in December 1961.

*For a brief review of the five types, see page 2 of Change in Belief Patterns, Part A. Tables of the data summarized in this section will be found in Appendix D.

V. THE "FALLOUT PROTECTION" BOOKLET READERSHIP*

In May 1962, just before the second interview, we sent everyone who had been interviewed in December 1961 a copy of the Government's pamphlet entitled "Fallout Protection." We examined the relationship between booklet readership and the various demographic and general civil defense information exposure indices and the changes in the eight statement content categories of the two fallout shelter and radiation sorts.

Booklet Readership.-- For purposes of analysis, the people were divided into two groups on their level of readership of the booklet. One group was composed of those who could not remember receiving the booklet and those who had received it but had not read it (non-readers). The other group had read some or all of the bulletin (readers). Readers were more likely to have obtained civil defense information from other sources than non-readers. This included talking about civil defense with others, noticing articles in magazines, and obtaining information from sources other than the media and other people. Also, readers were more likely to perceive the world situation as a changing one than non-readers. In addition, readers thought they had changed their sorting more of the fallout shelter statement than non-readers. In terms of demographic characteristics, people with children at home were more likely to have read the bulletin in whole or part than those without children at home. In terms of overall readership, a little more than half of the 105 people were classified as non-readers with then, a little less than half classified readers.

Change in Shelter Statement Sorting and Booklet Readership.-- The largest changes associated with booklet readership occurred with the information items in the fallout shelter sort. The people who had read all of the booklet reflected a gain in civil defense information during the six month period but for those who only read part, there was an information loss. Those who did not remember receiving the bulletin had an information gain. However, those who did remember receiving it but failed to read it, had an information loss.

There were some changes in the fallout shelter sorts associated with booklet readership in the area of the acceptance of fallout shelters. The people who became most accepting of shelters were those who did remember receiving the bulletin and did not read it. The ones who became less favorable toward shelters were the ones who read all of the bulletin. Those who read only part of the booklet, however, did become slightly more favorable toward shelters as reflected in the changes in their fallout shelter statement rankings. Lastly, the people who did not remember receiving the bulletin changed a very little bit toward less acceptance.

The other most notable changes associated with booklet readership involved changes in the shelter sort relating to religious fatalism. All readers who had some contact with the bulletin, became somewhat less fatalistic, the group changing the most being those who read the booklet in part. Finally, the group who could not remember receiving it changed toward a more religious fatalistic view.

*Tables of the data summarized in this section will be found in Appendix E.

VI. SUMMARY

We interviewed our respondents in December 1961 and June 1962. A month before the June interview, we sent everyone a copy of the government's bulletin entitled: "Fallout Protection." What kinds of changes occurred in this six month period?

What kinds of changes were reflected in the way our respondents sorted the shelter statements in June 1962 compared to December 1961. In overall tendencies, the people we interviewed were a little bit better informed but less actively concerned about civil defense matters at the end of the six month period than at the beginning. Most of the shifts in most of the shelter statement categories for most of the sub-groups of people were small. This suggests, on the whole, stability of belief patterns.

What are the correlates of general stability of the actual sorting of both the fallout shelter and peace and defense statements? The more highly educated and the book readers actually sorted both kinds of statements in a more stable manner than their counterparts. For fallout shelter statements, age was a factor--the younger, the more stable. Stability of sorting one kind of statement went with stability of sorting the other kind.

Were the belief patterns of the fallout shelter and radiation types and the peace and defense types stable? For the most part they were. Both the shifts in the belief patterns and the movement of people to other types (about a 1/4th moved) suggest a little more favorable attitude toward shelters. In the peace and defense types, four rather stable and one unstable patterns were found. The changes occurring in the patterns seemed to indicate an increasing concern over a somewhat worsening world situation. However, stability of belief pattern is the predominate indication.

What about booklet readership and change? Booklet readership was highest among those who exposed themselves to other information sources. When booklet readership (all of it) was highest, the people had shifts in shelter statement categories which suggested a civil defense information gain, somewhat less acceptance of shelters, and less religious fatalism in their point of view. For the people who read only part of the booklet, there was a small shift toward greater shelter favorability. The largest shift (still rather small) in the statement category showing greater shelter acceptance was among the people who remembered receiving the bulletin but who did not read it. Lastly, the people who only read part of the booklet had a slight civil defense information loss as reflected in the way they sorted the shelter statements on the two occasions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	TABLES FOR SECTION I
APPENDIX B:	TABLES FOR SECTION II
APPENDIX C:	TABLES FOR SECTION III
APPENDIX D:	TABLES FOR SECTION IV
APPENDIX E:	TABLES FOR SECTION V

APPENDIX A:
TABLES FOR SECTION I

APPENDIX A

Tables for Section I

The fallout shelter statements were sorted into 13 ranks for both interviews. For each statement content category, each subject was given a score which was the sum of the ranks of the statements contained in the category.* He had eight pairs of scores, composed of a category score for the 1961 sort and one for the 1962 sort. A change score for each category was then defined by subtracting the 1961 category score from the 1962 score. The means reported in the tables in this appendix were computed using these eight statement content category change scores. This applies to the similar tables in Appendices B and E.

* The polarities of some of the statements had to be adjusted. The specific procedures used are contained in the separate report, Technical Summary.

A1

TABLE 1

Average Shifts in the "Perceived Gov't Confusion on
Civil Defense" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more confusion

- = change toward less confusion

In the past few months, have you
talked to anyone about civil defense?

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-01.32 (N = 22)	-02.09 (N = 11)
Medium	-00.04 (N = 27)	-00.38 (N = 13)
Low	01.89 (N = 27)	02.20 (N = 05)
Total	.28	.58
Total overall shift = .042		

TABLE 2

Average Shifts in the "Community vs
Private Shelters" Statement Category for:
+ = change toward likeness of comm. better
- = change toward likeness of priv. better

Perceived change index

Initial Position	Mean	
	LO	HI
High	-02.12 (N = 26)	-01.00 (N = 13)
Medium	00.43 (N = 23)	01.25 (N = 12)
Low	01.29 (N = 17)	02.29 (N = 14)
Total	-.35	.87
Total overall shift = .103		

TABLE 3

Average Shifts in the "Community vs
Private Shelters" Statement Category for:
+ = change toward likeness of comm. better
- = change toward likeness of priv. better

Hours listened to radio last week

Initial Position	Mean		
	00-02	03-09	10-64
High	-01.00 (N = 13)	-02.05 (N = 19)	-02.29 (N = 07)
Medium	00.70 (N = 10)	00.70 (N = 10)	00.73 (N = 15)
Low	01.50 (N = 10)	01.00 (N = 09)	02.50 (N = 12)
Total	.27	-.60	.73

Total overall shift = .104

TABLE 4

Average Shifts in the "Active-Passive Concern on Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more activeness

- = change toward more passiveness

Residence Stability

Initial Position	Mean	
	LO	HI
High	-01.86 (N = 14)	-04.17 (N = 18)
Medium	-02.88 (N = 16)	-02.32 (N = 25)
Low	05.00 (N = 13)	02.26 (N = 19)
Total	-.17	-1.45

Total overall shift = -.19

TABLE 5

Average Shifts in the "Active-Passive Concern on Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more activeness

- = change toward more passiveness

Number of times attended
church in last four weeks

Initial Position	Mean	
	NONE	01 OR MORE
High	-02.81 (N = 16)	-03.50 (N = 16)
Medium	-03.35 (N = 17)	-01.96 (N = 24)
Low	02.00	04.20
Total	-1.73	-.32

Total overall shift = -.92

TABLE 6

Average Shifts in the "Active-Passive Concern on Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

- + = change toward more activeness
- = change toward more passiveness

In the past few months, have you noticed anything in magazines about civil defense or fallout shelters?

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-02.45 (N = 20)	-04.33 (N = 12)
Medium	-01.83 (N = 24)	-03.53 (N = 17)
Low	01.71 (N = 17)	05.27 (N = 15)
Total	-1.05	-.75

Total overall shift = -.92

TABLE 7

Average Shifts in the "Civil Defense is Government's Responsibility" Statement Category for:

- + = change toward more acceptance
- = change toward less acceptance

Number of children living at home

Initial Position	Mean	
	NONE	01 OR MORE
High	-04.60 (N = 10)	-02.04 (N = 26)
Medium	-01.17 (N = 12)	-00.32 (N = 22)
Low	02.63 (N = 08)	02.63 (N = 27)
Total	-1.30	.15

Total overall shift = -.22

TABLE 8

Average Shifts in the "Civil Defense is Government's Responsibility" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more acceptance

- = change toward less acceptance

Number of meetings attended in last four weeks

Initial Position	Mean	
	NONE	01 OR MORE
High	-04.25 (N = 20)	-00.88 (N = 16)
Medium	-00.58 (N = 19)	-00.67 (N = 15)
Low	02.28 (N = 18)	03.00 (N = 17)
Total	-.96	.56

Total overall shift = -.27

TABLE 9

Average Shifts in the "Pessimism-Optimism on Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater pessimism

- = change toward greater optimism

Have you noticed anything on television about civil defense or fallout shelters?

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-02.90 (N = 29)	-03.63 (N = 08)
Medium	00.09 (N = 23)	01.90 (N = 10)
Low	02.74 (N = 23)	04.00 (N = 12)
Total	-.25	1.27

Total overall shift = .18

TABLE 10

Average Shifts in the "Pessimism-Optimism on Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater pessimism

- = change toward greater optimism

In the past few months, have you talked to anyone about civil defense

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-02.58 (N = 31)	-05.50 (N = 06)
Medium	01.09 (N = 22)	-00.27 (N = 11)
Low	01.87 (N = 23)	05.67 (N = 12)
Total	-.17	1.11

Total overall shift=.18

TABLE 11

Average Shifts in the "Pessimism-Optimism on Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater pessimism

- = change toward greater optimism

Number of meetings attended in last four weeks

Initial Position	Mean	
	NONE	01 OR MORE
High	-01.94 (N = 17)	-04.00 (N = 20)
Medium	00.67 (N = 18)	00.60 (N = 15)
Low	02.82 (N = 22)	03.77 (N = 33)
Total	.72	-.46

Total overall shift=.18

TABLE 12

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more fatalism

- = change toward less fatalism

In the past few months, have you noticed
anything in magazines about civil
defense or fallout shelters?

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-02.47 (N = 17)	-03.59 (N = 17)
Medium	00.13 (N = 23)	-03.30 (N = 10)
Low	03.19 (N = 21)	01.06 (N = 17)
Total	.46	-1.73

Total overall shift=-.46

TABLE 13

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more fatalism

- = change toward less fatalism

Since the last interview, have you noticed
anything in the newspapers about civil
defense fallout shelters?

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-00.75 (N = 16)	-05.06 (N = 18)
Medium	-00.36 (N = 14)	-01.84 (N = 10)
Low	02.58 (N = 19)	01.89 (N = 19)
Total	.86	-1.61

Total overall shift=-.46

TABLE 14

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism"
Statement Category for:

- + = change toward more fatalism
- = change toward less fatalism

Have you noticed anything on television
about civil defense or fallout shelters?

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-02.70 (N = 20)	-03.50 (N = 14)
Medium	-00.35 (N = 26)	-03.00 (N = 07)
Low	02.66 (N = 29)	00.89 (N = 09)

Total .19 -2.07

Total overall shift=-.46

TABLE 15

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism"
Statement Category for:

- + = change toward more fatalism
- = change toward less fatalism

Have you gotten any other information
about civil defense or fallout shelters?

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-02.17 (N = 18)	-04.00 (N = 16)
Medium	-00.20 (N = 15)	-01.50 (N = 18)
Low	02.76 (N = 21)	01.59 (N = 17)

Total .29 -1.25

Total overall shift=-.46

TABLE 16

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism"

Statement Category for:

÷ = change toward more fatalism

- = change toward less fatalism

Number of books read in last month

Initial Position	Mean	
	NONE	01 OR MORE
High	-00.80 (N = 15)	-04.79 (N = 19)
Medium	00.00 (N = 19)	-02.14 (N = 14)
Low	03.12 (N = 17)	01.52 (N = 21)
Total	.80	-1.65

Total overall shift=-.46

TABLE 17

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism"

Statement Category for:

÷ = change toward more fatalism

- = change toward less fatalism

Perceived Change Index

Initial Position	Mean	
	LO	HI
High	-01.74 (N = 23)	-05.73 (N = 11)
Medium	-01.22 (N = 18)	-00.53 (N = 15)
Low	02.76 (N = 25)	01.23 (N = 13)
Total	.11	-1.41

Total overall shift=-.45

TABLE 18

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more fatalism

- = change toward less fatalism

Age

Initial Position	Mean		
	20-35	36-49	50 OR OVER
High	-01.79 (N = 14)	-04.00 (N = 11)	-03.78 (N = 09)
Medium	-02.45 (N = 11)	-03.18 (N = 11)	02.91 (N = 11)
Low	02.77 (N = 13)	01.06 (N = 17)	03.88 (N = 08)
Total	-.42	-1.56	1.04

Total overall shift=-.45

TABLE 19

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more fatalism

- = change toward less fatalism

Number of children at home

Initial Position	Mean	
	NONE	01 OR MORE
High	-01.22 (N = 09)	-03.68 (N = 25)
Medium	00.27 (N = 11)	-01.50 (N = 22)
Low	03.70 (N = 10)	01.71 (N = 28)
Total	.97	-1.03

Total overall shift=-.46

TABLE 20

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more fatalism

- = change toward less fatalism

Hours watched TV in last week

Initial Position	Mean		
	00-04	05-12	13-44
High	-03.33 (N = 09)	-04.53 (N = 15)	-00.50 (N = 10)
Medium	-01.90 (N = 10)	00.00 (N = 10)	-00.85 (N = 13)
Low	03.07 (N = 15)	-01.18 (N = 11)	04.33 (N = 12)
Total	-.09	-2.25	1.03

Total overall shift=-.46

TABLE 21

Average Shifts in the "Shelter Acceptance"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater acceptance

- = change toward less acceptance

Perceived Change Index

Initial Position	Mean	
	LO	HI
High	-02.44 (N = 16)	-04.88 (N = 17)
Medium	02.15 (N = 26)	-03.00 (N = 09)
Low	04.67 (N = 24)	04.08 (N = 13)
Total	1.95	-1.46

Total overall shift=.68

TABLE 22

Average Shifts in the "Shelter Acceptance"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater acceptance

- = change toward less acceptance

Number of books read in last month

Initial Position	Mean	
	NONE	01 OR MORE
High	-04.50 (N = 16)	-02.94 (N = 17)
Medium	-03.65 (N = 20)	06.80 (N = 15)
Low	03.93 (N = 15)	04.82 (N = 22)
Total	-1.69	2.93

Total overall shift = .69

TABLE 23

Average Shifts in the "Shelter Acceptance"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater acceptance

- = change toward less acceptance

Hours listened to radio last week

Initial Position	Mean		
	00-02	03-09	10-64
High	-00.57 (N = 07)	-03.54 (N = 13)	-05.54 (N = 13)
Medium	01.22 (N = 09)	00.73 (N = 15)	00.64 (N = 11)
Low	05.71 (N = 17)	05.20 (N = 10)	01.60 (N = 10)
Total	3.15	.45	-1.44

Total overall shift = .69

TABLE 24

Average Shifts in the "Shelter Acceptance"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater acceptance

- = change toward less acceptance

Hours watched TV in last week

Initial Position	Mean		
	00-04	05-12	13-44
High	-04.20 (N = 10)	-04.22 (N = 09)	-03.00 (N = 14)
Medium	01.20 (N = 10)	02.27 (N = 11)	-00.57 (N = 14)
Low	02.50 (N = 14)	07.44 (N = 16)	01.57 (N = 07)
Total	.15	2.95	-1.11

Total overall shift=.69

TABLE 25

Average Shifts in the "Shelter Acceptance"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater acceptance

- = change toward less acceptance

Have you gotten any other information
about civil defense or fallout shelters?

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-01.06 (N = 16)	-06.18 (N = 17)
Medium	00.96 (N = 23)	00.58 (N = 12)
Low	01.47 (N = 15)	06.50 (N = 22)
Total	.50	.88

Total overall shift=.63

TABLE 26

Average Shifts in the "Shelter Acceptance"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater acceptance

- = change toward less acceptance

Number of children at home

Initial Position	Mean	
	NONE	01 OR MORE
High	00.40 (N = 05)	-04.43 (N = 28)
Medium	01.07 (N = 15)	00.65 (N = 20)
Low	01.30 (N = 10)	05.63 (N = 27)
Total	1.04	.55

Total overall shift=. 69

TABLE 27

Average Shifts in the "Information Gain"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward information gain

- = change toward information loss

Have you notice anything on television
about civil defense or fallout shelters?

Initial Position	Mean	
	NO	YES
High	-02.09 (N = 24)	-07.38 (N = 13)
Medium	03.37 (N = 27)	-02.25 (N = 08)
Low	05.42 (N = 24)	06.33 (N = 09)
Total	2.31	-1.90

Total overall shift=1.11

TABLE 28

Average Shifts in the "Information Gain"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward information gain

- = change toward information loss

Number of meetings attended
in last four weeks

Initial Position	Mean	
	NONE	01 OR MORE
High	-05.90 (N = 21)	-01.25 (N = 16)
Medium	02.82 (N = 17)	01.39 (N = 18)
Low	04.47 (N = 19)	07.29 (N = 14)
Total	.16	2.23

Total overall shift=1.11

TABLE 29

Average Shifts in the "Information Gain"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward information gain

- = change toward information loss

Number of children at home

Initial Position	Mean	
	NCNE	01 OR MORE
High	-07.70 (N = 10)	-02.48 (N = 27)
Medium	-00.10 (N = 10)	02.96 (N = 25)
Low	06.00 (N = 10)	05.52 (N = 23)
Total	-.60	1.79

Total overall shift=1.11

TABLE 30

Average Shifts in the "Information Gain"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward information gain

- = change toward information loss

Age

Initial Position	Mean		
	20-35	36-49	50 OR OVER
High	00.00 (N = 18)	-09.69 (N = 13)	-03.00 (N = 06)
Medium	04.11 (N = 09)	01.67 (N = 12)	01.14 (N = 14)
Low	02.91 (N = 11)	05.93 (N = 14)	09.00 (N = 08)
Total	1.82	-.59	2.50

Total overall shift=1.11

TABLE 31

Average Shifts in the "Information Gain"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward information gain

- = change toward information loss

Hours listened to radio last week

Initial Position	Mean		
	00-02	03-09	10-64
High	-02.36 (N = 11)	-04.89 (N = 18)	-03.75 (N = 08)
Medium	00.83 (N = 12)	04.18 (N = 11)	01.42 (N = 12)
Low	06.10 (N = 10)	05.00 (N = 09)	05.79 (N = 14)
Total	1.36	.08	2.00

Total overall shift=1.10

TABLE 32

Average Shifts in the "Information Gain"

Statement Category for:

+ = change toward information gain

- = change toward information loss

Hours watched TV in last week

Initial Position	Mean		
	00-04	05-12	13-44
High	-05.58 (N = 12)	-02.53 (N = 15)	-03.90 (N = 10)
Medium	03.36 (N = 14)	00.90 (N = 10)	01.55 (N = 11)
Low	09.88 (N = 08)	01.82 (N = 11)	06.29 (N = 14)
Total	1.74	-.25	1.89

Total overall shift=1.11

APPENDIX B:
TABLES FOR SECTION II

TABLE 1

FALLOUT SHELTERS AND RADIATION STATEMENTS:
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE DEGREE TO WHICH A SUBJECT ACTUALLY
SORTED THE STATEMENTS THE SAME WAY AND VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC
AND GENERAL CIVIL DEFENSE INFORMATION EXPOSURE VARIABLES**

Var. No.	Variable	Code	Corre- lation
14	Last grade which was completed in school	Actual last grade completed	207
23	Number of books read in the past month	Actual number of books read	209
7	"In the past few months, have you talked with anyone about civil defense?"	0 - No, DK 1 - Yes	255

*With an N = 104, a correlation of .193 is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed).

**A matrix of innercorrelations between all pairs of the demographic and exposure variables will be found in the appendix of the technical summary. The variable number refers to each variable's location in this matrix.

TABLE 2

FALLOUT SHELTERS AND RADIATION STATEMENTS:
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE DEGREE TO WHICH A SUBJECT THOUGHT HE
SORTED THE STATEMENTS THE SAME WAY AND VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC
AND GENERAL CIVIL DEFENSE INFORMATION EXPOSURE VARIABLES**

Var. No.	Variable	Code	Corre- lation
23	Number of books read in the past month	Actual number of books read	267
9	"Have you gotten a copy of the governments' bulletin on 'Fallout Protection.'" (yes, DK, no)	0 - If no 1 - If yes, all no below	.323
	"If YES: Did you read it?" (yes, yes in part, no)	3 - If yes in part, no below 4 - If yes, no below	
	"If YES or YES IN PART: Did you discuss the bulletin with anyone?"	5 - If yes	

*With an N = 104, a correlation of .193 is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed).

**A matrix of innercorrelations between all pairs of the demographic and exposure variables will be found in the appendix of the technical summary. The variable number refers to each variable's location in this matrix.

TABLE 3

Average Shifts in the "Information
Gain" Statement Category for:

+ = information gain
- = information loss

As best you can remember, did you sort
these cards (SHELTERS) any differently
than you did last December?

Initial Information Level	NO	DK	YES
High	-05.00 (N = 20)	-02.18 (N = 11)	-03.33 (N = 06)
Medium	-00.14 (N = 21)	03.67 (N = 09)	03.60 (N = 05)
Low	03.67 (N = 21)	07.29 (N = 07)	11.80 (N = 05)
Total	-.42	2.22	5.13

Total overall shift = 1.10

TABLE 4

Average Shifts in the "Perceived Government
Confusion on Civil Defense" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward perception of more confusion
- = change toward perception of less confusion

As best you can remember, did you sort
these cards (SHELTERS) any differently
than you did last December?

Initial Position on Degree of Confusion	NO	DK	YES
High	-01.39 (N = 23)	-02.00 (N = 08)	-02.00 (N = 02)
Medium	-00.05 (N = 22)	-00.92 (N = 12)	01.00 (N = 06)
Low	01.12 (N = 17)	03.00 (N = 07)	02.75 (N = 08)
Total	-.23	-.22	1.50

Total overall shift = .036

TABLE 5

Average Shifts in the "Active-Passive Concern
for Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

- + = change toward more active concern
- = change toward more passive concern

As best you can remember, did you sort
these cards (SHELTERS) any differently
than you did last December?

Initial Position	NO	DK	YES
Active	-02.63 (N = 19)	-02.90 (N = 10)	-07.33 (N = 03)
Intermediate	-02.00 (N = 27)	-03.00 (N = 06)	-04.00 (N = 08)
Passive	03.50 (N = 16)	02.64 (N = 11)	04.60 (N = 05)
Total	-.77	-.67	-1.94

Total overall shift = .92

TABLE 6

Average Shifts in the "Civil Defense is
Government's Responsibility" Statement Category for:

- + = change toward more acceptance of proposition
- = change toward less acceptance of proposition

As best you can remember, did you sort
these cards (SHELTERS) any differently
than you did last December?

Initial Position on Acceptance of Proposition	NO	DK	YES
High	-03.09 (N = 22)	-02.75 (N = 08)	-01.50 (N = 06)
Medium	01.05 (N = 20)	-02.44 (N = 09)	-04.00 (N = 05)
Low	02.70 (N = 20)	03.40 (N = 10)	00.80 (N = 05)
Total	.11	-.37	-1.56

Total overall shift = -.27

TABLE 7

Average Shifts in the "Community vs
Private Shelters" Statement Category for:
+ = change toward acceptance of Community Shelters
- = change toward acceptance of Private Shelters

As best you can remember, did you sort
these cards (SHELTERS) any differently
than you did last December?

Initial
Position
on Acceptance
of Community
Shelters

	NO	DK	YES
High	-01.71 (N = 24)	-01.92 (N = 12)	-01.33 (N = 03)
Medium	00.87 (N = 23)	00.29 (N = 07)	00.60 (N = 05)
Low	02.20 (N = 15)	01.13 (N = 08)	01.50 (N = 08)
Total	.19	-.44	.67

Total overall shift = .101

TABLE 8

Average Shifts in the "Religious
Fatalism" Statement Category for:
+ = change toward more fatalism
- = change toward less fatalism

As best you can remember, did you sort
these cards (SHELTERS) any differently
than you did last December?

Initial
Position
on Religious
Fatalism

	NO	DK	YES
High	-03.14 (N = 21)	-01.38 (N = 08)	-05.20 (N = 05)
Medium	-00.17 (N = 18)	01.40 (N = 10)	-02.60 (N = 05)
Low	01.43 (N = 23)	03.00 (N = 09)	04.17 (N = 06)
Total	-.58	.07	-.87

Total overall shift = -.46

TABLE 9

Average Shifts in the "Pessimism-Optimism
on Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater pessimism

- = change toward greater optimism

As best you can remember, did you sort
these cards (SHELTERS) any differently
than you did last December?

Initial Position on Optimism	NO	DK	YES
High	-04.86 (N = 21)	-00.40 (N = 10)	-01.17 (N = 06)
Medium	00.84 (N = 19)	02.38 (N = 08)	-02.33 (N = 06)
Low	03.18 (N = 22)	01.67 (N = 09)	06.50 (N = 04)
Total	-.26	1.11	.31

Total overall shift = .18

TABLE 10

Average Shifts in the "Shelter
Acceptance" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater acceptance

- = change toward less acceptance

As best you can remember, did you sort
these cards (SHELTERS) any differently
than you did last December?

Initial Position on Shelter Acceptance	NO	DK	YES
High	-01.94 (N = 17)	-04.80 (N = 10)	-06.83 (N = 06)
Medium	01.50 (N = 24)	00.71 (N = 07)	-03.00 (N = 04)
Low	07.00 (N = 21)	-01.20 (N = 10)	05.00 (N = 06)
Total	2.42	-2.04	-1.44

Total overall shift = .68

TABLE 11

PEACE AND DEFENSE STATEMENTS:
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE DEGREE TO WHICH A SUBJECT ACTUALLY
SORTED THE STATEMENTS IN THE SAME WAY AND VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC
AND GENERAL CIVIL DEFENSE INFORMATION EXPOSURE VARIABLES**

Var. No.	Variable	Code	Corre- lation
12	Age of subject	Actual age	-290
14	Last grade which was completed in school	Actual last grade completed	335
7	"In the past few months, have you talked with anyone about civil defense?"	0 - No, DK 1 - Yes	250

*With an N = 104, a correlation of .193 is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed).

**A matrix of innercorrelations between all pairs of the demographic and exposure variables will be found in the appendix of the technical summary. The variable number refers to each variable's location in this matrix.

APPENDIX C:
TABLES OF SECTION III

TABLE 1

FALLOUT SHELTER AND RADIATION TYPE A:
CHANGE IN BELIEF PATTERN

December 1961

I tend to disagree that it is the government's responsibility to protect all citizens by supplying them, rich and poor, with shelters.

I slightly disagree with the idea that I don't like to talk about war and would rather not read anything about fallout shelters or things like that.

I agree very strongly that everyone should find out as much as he can about fallout shelters and other civil defense matters so that he can be prepared in case of attack.

June 1962

I tend to agree that it is the government's responsibility to protect all citizens by supplying them, rich and poor, with shelters.

I disagree more strongly about this now.

While I still agree with this idea it is not as important to me as before.

Note: Table includes only those items which shifted by more than .5 standard deviations. These include no information items, only attitudinal.

TABLE 2

FALLOUT SHELTER AND RADIATION TYPE B:
CHANGE IN BELIEF PATTERN

Attitudinal Items

December 1961

June 1962

I know that if all of us prayed for peace there would be nothing to worry about is a ridiculous notion.

I shall think that if all of us prayed for peace this still would not solve our problems but it might not be quite as ridiculous as I once thought.

My own problems rarely, if ever, get in the way of my worries about the Russians or fallout shelters.

I'm not so sure whether my own problems do or do not get in the way of my worries about the Russians or fallout shelters.

I don't mind talking about war or reading about fallout shelters and things like that.

I'm not so sure I want to talk about war or read about fallout shelters and things like that.

I don't know whether community shelters would be a good idea or not.

Maybe, community shelters would not be such a bad idea after all.

I don't think there is really anything an ordinary citizen like me can do to protect himself in case of a nuclear war.

There may be just a very very few things that an ordinary citizen like me can do to protect himself in case of nuclear war.

There may be a little merit in the idea that the government should lend money to communities so that community shelters can be built.

I'm not sure any more that the government should lend money to build community shelters.

I just don't believe that when a person dies his time is up and that there's nothing anyone can do about it.

I still believe this and maybe it's a little stronger than it used to be.

Informational Items

I don't know whether an adequate family shelter would cost more than \$300.

I am pretty sure an adequate family shelter would cost more than \$300.

It's somewhat doubtful that after a nuclear attack you could make the air safe to breathe by just filtering out the dust.

You might be able to make the air after a nuclear attack safe to breathe by filtering out the dust.

TABLE 2 (continued)

December 1961

June 1962

I am pretty sure that while the blast and heat damage from a nuclear explosion is limited to several miles around the point where it explodes, fallout from it may cover thousands of square miles.

I don't know if you are likely to die if you get exposed to radiation.

Contaminated people, food, water and other things after an attack probably should be avoided by people who have not been exposed.

If we are attacked, I just don't know if great storms caused by the nuclear explosions would sweep across our country.

I am almost positive of this now.

You would not necessarily die if you got exposed to radiation.

I'm not so sure that contaminated people, food, water and other things have to be avoided by people who have not been exposed.

In that we are attacked, I don't think it's too likely that great storms caused by the nuclear explosions would sweep across our country.

Note: Table includes only those items which shifted by more than .6 standard deviations.

TABLE 3

FALLOUT SHELTER AND RADIATION TYPE C:
CHANGE IN BELIEF PATTERN

ATTITUDINAL ITEMS

December 1961

June 1962

I think there is something an ordinary citizen like me can do to protect himself in case of a nuclear war.

I'm not so sure that there is anything an ordinary citizen like me can do to protect himself in case of nuclear attack.

This fuss about fallout shelters is not a lot of nonsense.

I just don't know whether this fuss about fallout shelters is nonsense or not.

It is absurd to think I would run for the hills in the event of an attack.

I don't know whether I'd run for the hills in the event of an attack.

I don't worry much whether to build a fallout shelter or not.

I worry a little bit about whether I should build a fallout shelter or not.

I don't believe that the people in government should stop talking so much about fallout shelters and do something about them.

I believe a little that maybe it is time to stop talking about fallout shelters and do something about them.

I agree somewhat that in the eyes of God, things like fallout shelters are immoral.

I still believe this and even more than I did before.

I'm quite sure we should try hard to prevent war and not give so much attention to shelters.

I don't know about this now.

I think we probably need fallout shelters around here.

I'm even more sure we need fallout shelters around here.

I tend to agree that our area will probably get a heavy dose of fallout radioactive materials, in the event of attack.

I tend to disagree with this idea.

TABLE 3 (continued)

Information Items

December 1961

I'm pretty sure it is not true that even though radiation is invisible, it is simple to detect fallout.

I'm pretty sure that a plastic suit with a filtering mask is not good protection against most fallout.

It is somewhat doubtful that after a nuclear attack, if you filter the dust out of the air, the air will be perfectly safe to breathe.

Generally I don't believe that if you get exposed to radiation at all you are likely to die.

While blast and heat damage from a nuclear explosion is limited to several miles, fallout can cover thousands of square miles.

June 1962

I don't know whether it is simple to detect fallout even though radiation is invisible.

I'm not sure, but I don't think that a plastic suit with a filtering mask is good protection against much fallout.

I'm pretty sure that after a nuclear attack the air won't be safe to breathe, even if you filter the dust out.

I'm quite sure that if you get exposed to radiation at all, you are not likely to die.

I'm not sure that's true.

Note: Table includes only those items which shifted .9 standard deviations.

TABLE 4

FALLOUT SHELTER AND RADIATION TYPE D:
CHANGE IN BELIEF PATTERNS

Attitudinal Items

December 1961

I completely reject the idea that in the eyes of God, things like fallout shelters are immoral.

I agree a little that everyone should find out as much as he can about fallout shelters and other civil defense matters so that he can be prepared in case of attack.

I'm fairly sure that if I had the money, I probably wouldn't get a fallout shelter built for my family right away.

I don't think that if all of us prayed for peace there would be nothing to worry about.

I agree strongly that on this fallout shelter business I'll do whatever the government thinks is best to do.

I think there is something an ordinary citizen like me can do to protect himself in case of a nuclear war.

I'm not sure, but I don't think there might be some protection against radioactive fallout.

Maybe we need fallout shelters around here.

June 1962

I still don't believe it, however, I don't disbelieve it as much as I used to.

I'm much more sure about this idea.

I don't know if I'd get a fallout shelter built for my family right away if I had the money.

I completely disbelieve this idea now.

I suppose I'll go along with what the government thinks is best on this fallout shelter business.

I feel much more strongly that there is something an ordinary citizen like me can do to protect himself in case of a nuclear war.

I'm quite sure there is some protection against radioactive fallout.

I'm pretty sure we need fallout shelters around here.

TABLE 4 (continued)

Information Items

December 1961

I don't believe at all that if you get exposed to radiation at all, you are likely to die.

I don't believe at all that the earth will be impossible to live in for years or even centuries after a nuclear attack.

Filtering the dust out of the air after an attack will not make it safe to breathe.

Fallout might be like gas. How could you protect yourself from it?

June 1962

I'm not sure whether you will die or not if you are exposed to radiation at all.

I still don't believe this but not so strongly now.

You might be able to filter the dust out of the air after a nuclear attack to make it safe to breathe.

This is just not true.

Note: Table includes only those items which shifted at least 1.0 standard deviation.

TABLE 5

FALLOUT SHELTERS AND RADIATION TYPES:
MEAN DIFFERENCES IN THE BELIEF ARRAYS FOR 1961 & 1962 IN THE
CATEGORIES OF STATEMENTS

General Categories	No. of items	Type			
		A	B	C	D
Perceived Gov't Confusion	1	+.242	-.295	+.221	+.339
Community Vs Private Shelters	1	+.189	-.315	+.385	-.208
Active-Passive Concern	5	-.001	-.320	-.071	+.457
Civil Defense is Gov't Responsibility	5	+.087	-.177	+.231	-.337
Pessimism-Optimism	5	+.031	-.194	+.135	-.632
Religious Fatalism	4	-.080	+.187	+.098	+.202
Shelter Acceptance	12	+.086	+.187	-.303	+.037
Information Gain	15	-.041	+.269	-.169	+.046

+ = more accepted

- = more rejected

TABLE 6

CHANGES IN FALLOUT SHELTER AND RADIATION TYPES FOR
INDIVIDUALS FROM 1961 to 1962

Original Fallout Shelter and Radiation Type in 1961		Changed to Type in 1962				
Type	No. of Individuals	A	B	C	D	NA
A	64	1	1	1	7	1
B	15	2	9	0	3	1
C	11	4	0	5	1	1
D	10	7	1	0	1	1
NA	4	1	0	0	1	2
Total of Types in 1962		68	11	6	13	6

NA = Not Assigned

TABLE 7

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE DEGREE TO WHICH SUBJECTS WERE
LIKE EACH OF THE FOUR FALLOUT SHELTER AND RADIATION TYPES
IN DECEMBER 1961 AND JUNE 1962

		June 1962			
December 1961	Types	A	B	C	D
	A	.72	.00	-.23	.34
	B	.06	.71	-.31	.17
	C	-.39	-.26	.63	-.26
	D	.44	.07	-.21	.60

APPENDIX D
TABLES FOR SECTION IV

TABLE 1

PEACE AND DEFENSE TYPE A:
CHANGE IN BELIEF PATTERNS

December 1961

June 1962

I believe strongly that the chances of an attack on the U.S. are very small, but it would be a good thing to prepare for it now.

I don't believe this now.

Generally I would say we should not organize a march on Washington to get our leaders and the Russian leaders to stop testing nuclear bombs.

I'm positive we should not organize a march on Washington.

It is somewhat doubtful that Russia and China are going to start fighting each other so there is no use in our worrying about an attack from Russia.

I'm very sure that Russia and China are not going to start fighting each other.

We need a strong military defense to back up the President when he takes a firm stand on international issues.

I just don't know if we need a strong military defense to back up the President.

We're not going to attack anybody, so the stronger we are the less likely war is.

I just don't know how strong we should be or if we will attack anybody.

I haven't thought much about war or the possibility of nuclear attack.

I'm somewhat more worried about war or the possibility of nuclear attack.

I'm somewhat concerned about somebody pushing the wrong button at the wrong time.

I'm not concerned at all about someone pushing the wrong button at the wrong time.

We are strong enough so that no sensible nation would attack us for fear of retaliation.

I still believe this but not as much as before.

I think the Civil Defense people are doing the best job possible to help us prepare, in case we are ever attacked.

I don't know if the Civil Defense people are doing the best job possible or not.

Lately, the world situation has been improving along with the chances for peace.

I guess things are getting better but I'm not so sure any more.

TABLE 1 (continued)

December 1961	June 1962
I'm fairly sure there won't be a third world war.	I don't know if there will ever be a third world war or not.
Generally, I suppose, if we were really threatened by Russia we might attack first to take advantage of the surprise.	I'm not very sure, but generally I say we should <u>not</u> attack first, even if really threatened.
The U.N. should get more power to make it a true world government.	I don't know if giving the U.N. more power would help the situation.
I don't know if our leaders should cooperate internationally or not.	I'm convinced that international cooperation and understanding by our leaders could probably prevent war.
I'm not concerned at all about the cold war and nuclear attack.	The problems of the cold war and nuclear attack get on my nerves somewhat. I wish somebody would do something about them.
I have a lot of trust in our government leaders.	I don't know whether to trust our government leaders or not, after the Cuban mistake and things like that.
It is doubtful that we'll have a nuclear attack on the U.S.	I'm quite sure the U.S. will not have a nuclear attack. What would the Russians do with a radioactive wasteland?
I think we have been told the full story on the devastating effects of nuclear war.	Maybe we haven't been told the full story. I don't know.
I guess our leaders ought to keep talking at disarmament conferences and in the U.N.	I'm sure our leaders ought to keep talking, when you're talking you're not shooting.
Generally I disagree that life after a nuclear attack would be a savage man-to-man struggle for survival.	It looks to me as though life probably would be somewhat of a savage man-to-man struggle for survival after nuclear attack.

Note: Table contains only those items which shifted 1.0 standard deviations.

D3

TABLE 2

PEACE AND DEFENSE TYPE B:
CHANGE IN BELIEF PATTERNS

December 1961	June 1962
Generally I am somewhat concerned that someone may push the wrong button at the wrong time.	I'm more concerned about the possibility of mistake in pushing buttons than I was before.
Generally I disagree with the idea that if our leaders would make a real effort to understand and cooperate with the leaders of Russia and Red China, we could probably prevent war.	I still disagree with this idea but not as much as before.

Note: Table contains only those items which shifted at least .5 standard deviations.

TABLE 3

PEACE AND DEFENSE TYPE C:
CHANGE IN BELIEF PATTERNS

December 1961	June 1962
I'm positive we'll never have a nuclear attack on the U.S. What would the Russians do with a radioactive wasteland?	It is doubtful that we'll ever have a nuclear attack on the U.S.
I guess we're not getting closer and closer to war with Russia.	It's obvious that every day we are getting farther and farther from war with Russia.
I suppose there might be a third world war.	I don't think there will be a third world war.

Note: Table contains only those items which shifted at least 1.0 standard deviations.

D4

TABLE 4

PEACE AND DEFENSE TYPE D:
CHANGE IN BELIEF PATTERNS

December 1961

I'm quite sure that the chance of thermonuclear attack is not very likely, but the results would be so disastrous--we'd be smart to prepare against it--now.

It is doubtful that the best way to keep out of war is not to prepare for one.

I'm really very much concerned about whether we'll have a nuclear war or not.

I think probably our leaders should keep talking at disarmament conferences and in the U.N.

June 1962

I'm not so sure about the chance of an attack on the U.S.

I'm quite sure that the idea of keeping out of war by not preparing for one is not correct.

I'm still concerned about nuclear war, but not as much as I use to be.

I'm sure our leaders should keep talking. When you are talking you're not shooting.

Note: Table contains only those items which shifted at least .9 standard deviations.

D5

TABLE 5

PEACE AND DEFENSE TYPE E:
CHANGE IN BELIEF PATTERNS

December 1961

I suppose that if Russia really threatened us we should attack first to take advantage of the surprise.

Every day we seem to be getting closer and closer to war with Russia.

I'm quite sure that after a nuclear attack, life here would be a savage man-to-man struggle for survival.

I don't think that the best way to settle this whole thing is for us to make a surprise attack on the Russians.

I suppose we'll all have to get use to living with the threat of nuclear attack.

I'm not at all worried about someone pushing the wrong button at the wrong time.

June 1962

I don't think that even if we are really threatened we should attack first.

I'm not sure but we don't seem to be getting closer and closer to war with Russia.

I suppose that life here would be a savage man-to-man struggle for survival after a nuclear attack.

I'm very sure that making a surprise attack on Russia is not the way to settle this whole thing.

I'm sure the threat of nuclear attack will be with us for a long time and we may as well get use to living with it.

I just don't know about this problem.

D6

TABLE 6

PEACE AND DEFENSE TYPES:
MEAN DIFFERENCES IN BELIEF ARRAYS
FOR 1961 AND 1962 IN CATEGORIES OF STATEMENTS

General Categories	No. of Items	Type				
		A	B	C	D	E
After effects	4	+ .571	+ .153	+ .040	- .123	- .356
Cooperate	6	- .071	+ .136	- .057	+ .135	+ .094
Less fear of war	8	- .276	- .048	- .071	- .046	- .275
Attack/Not attack	3	+ .062	- .295	- .230	+ .257	- 1.111
Passive Indifference	3	- .032	- .149	+ .461	+ .378	+ .233
Military Preparati	3	- 1.212	+ .121	- .243	+ .569	- .032
Civil Defense Prepara- tion	2	- 1.719	- .198	+ .408	- .358	+ .364
Disturbed--someone else solve problem	3	+ 1.142	- .240	+ .023	- .019	- .257
Trust in gov't leaders	2	- 1.346	+ .240	- .607	- .494	- .379
Other	2	+ .750	- .147	+ .043	+ .231	+ .453

+ = more accepted
- = more rejected

TABLE 7

CHANGES IN PEACE AND DEFENSE TYPES FOR
INDIVIDUALS FROM 1961 TO 1962

Original Peace and Defense Type in 1961		Changed to Type in 1962					
Type	No. of Individuals	A	B	C	D	E	NA
A	14	7	3	0	4	0	0
B	48	4	33	1	9	1	0
C	8	1	0	6	0	0	1
D	21	2	7	0	11	0	1
E	10	1	6	0	0	2	1
NA	3	0	0	1	0	0	2
Total of Types in 1962		15	49	8	24	3	5

NA = Not Assigned

TABLE 8

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE DEGREE TO WHICH SUBJECTS
WERE LIKE EACH OF THE FIVE PEACE AND DEFENSE TYPES IN
DECEMBER 1961 AND JUNE 1962

December 1961	Type	A	B	C	D	E
	A	.73	.35	.27	.33	.21
	B	.24	.70	.06	.22	.44
	C	.27	.24	.54	.09	.11
	D	.46	.19	.22	.61	.21
	E	.26	.51	-.03	.15	.57

APPENDIX E:
TABLES FOR SECTION V

TABLE 1

BOOKLET READERSHIP AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME
(Frequencies Are Reported in the Table)

Booklet Readership	Number of children living at home:		TOTAL
	None	One or More	
Non-readers	21	35	56
Readers	9	40	49
TOTAL	30	75	105

TABLE 2

**BOOKLET READERSHIP AND
TALKING ABOUT CIVIL DEFENSE WITH OTHERS**

Booklet Readership	In the past few months, have you talked to any- one about civil defense?		TOTAL
	No or Don't Know	Yes	
Non-readers	46	10	56
Readers	30	19	49
TOTAL	76	29	105

TABLE 3

**BOOKLET READERSHIP AND NOTICING THINGS
IN MAGAZINES ABOUT CIVIL DEFENSE**

Booklet Readership	In the past few months, have you noticed anything in magazines about civil defense or fallout shelters?		TOTAL
	No or Don't Know	Yes	
Non-readers	38	18	56
Readers	23	26	49
TOTAL	61	44	105

TABLE 4

**BOOKLET READERSHIP AND GETTING
OTHER CIVIL DEFENSE INFORMATION**

Booklet Readership	Have you gotten any other information about civil defense or fallout shelters?		TOTAL
	No or Don't Know	Yes	
Non-readers	36	20	56
Readers	18	31	49
TOTAL	54	51	105

TABLE 5

**BOOKLET READERSHIP AND PERCEIVED
CHANGE INDEX OF WORLD SITUATION**

Booklet Readership	Change Index		TOTAL
	Sees World Changing	Does Not See World Changing	
Non-readers	43	13	56
Readers	23	26	49
TOTAL	66	39	105

TABLE 6

Average Shifts in the "Information
Gain" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward information gain

- = change toward information loss

Did you receive a copy
of the bulletin?

If yes above, did you read it?

Initial Position	Mean			
	NO, NO	YES, NO	YES, YES IN PART	YES, YES
High	-08.90 (N = 10)	01.57 (N = 07)	-04.22 (N = 09)	-02.55 (N = 11)
Medium	-00.71 (N = 14)	02.17 (N = 06)	00.88 (N = 08)	09.00 (N = 07)
Low	00.56 (N = 09)	04.00 (N = 10)	-01.00 (N = 05)	16.33 (N = 09)
Total	-2.85	2.73	-1.63	6.74

Total overall shift = 1.10

TABLE 7

Average Shifts in the "Shelter
Acceptance" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater acceptance

- = change toward less acceptance

Did you receive a copy
of the bulletin?

If yes above, did you read it?

Initial Position	Mean			
	NO, NO	YES, NO	YES, YES IN PART	YES, YES
High	-01.44 (N = 09)	-04.83 (N = 06)	-04.00 (N = 08)	-04.80 (N = 10)
Medium	-00.33 (N = 15)	03.50 (N = 06)	06.60 (N = 05)	-02.22 (N = 09)
Low	00.67 (N = 09)	08.00 (N = 11)	03.33 (N = 09)	05.13 (N = 08)
Total	-.36	3.48	1.41	-1.00

TABLE 8

Average Shifts in the "Religious Fatalism" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more fatalism

- = change toward less fatalism

Did you receive a copy
of the bulletin?

If yes above, did you read it?

Initial Position	Mean			
	NO, NO	YES, NO	YES, YES IN PART	YES, YES
High	01.20 (N = 10)	-02.00 (N = 07)	-08.25 (N = 08)	-03.89 (N = 09)
Medium	01.00 (N = 10)	-03.00 (N = 06)	-05.00 (N = 05)	00.25 (N = 12)
Low	04.31 (N = 13)	01.90 (N = 10)	-00.56 (N = 09)	02.50 (N = 06)
Total	2.36	-.57	-4.37	-.63
Total overall shift = -.46				

TABLE 9

Average Shifts in the "Pessimism-Optimism on Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward greater pessimism

- = change toward greater optimism

Did you receive a copy
of the bulletin?

If yes above, did you read it?

Initial Position	Mean			
	NO, NO	YES, NO	YES, YES IN PART	YES, YES
High	-02.82 (N = 11)	-03.20 (N = 10)	-06.17 (N = 06)	-01.30 (N = 10)
Medium	01.27 (N = 11)	01.89 (N = 09)	00.17 (N = 06)	-01.57 (N = 07)
Low	02.64 (N = 11)	02.00 (N = 04)	03.20 (N = 10)	04.20 (N = 10)
Total	.36	-.30	-.18	.68
Total overall shift = .18				

TABLE 10

Average Shifts in the "Civil Defense is Government's Responsibility" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more acceptance
- = change toward less acceptance

Did you receive a copy
of the bulletin?

If yes above, did you read it?

Initial Position	Mean			
	NO, NO	YES, NO	YES, YES IN PART	YES, YES
High	-03.45 (N = 11)	-03.50 (N = 06)	-03.89 (N = 09)	-00.50 (N = 10)
Medium	00.85 (N = 13)	00.00 (N = 08)	-00.71 (N = 07)	-04.50 (N = 06)
Low	03.00 (N = 09)	03.22 (N = 09)	04.50 (N = 06)	00.82 (N = 11)
Total	.00	.35	-.59	-.85

Total overall shift = -.27

TABLE 11

Average Shifts in the "Active-Passive Concern on Civil Defense Matters" Statement Category for:

+ = change toward more activeness
- = change toward more passiveness

Did you receive a copy
of the bulletin?

If yes above, did you read it?

Initial Position	Mean			
	NO, NO	YES, NO	YES, YES IN PART	YES, YES
High	-03.09 (N = 11)	-03.29 (N = 07)	-03.57 (N = 07)	-02.71 (N = 07)
Medium	-02.55 (N = 11)	-03.75 (N = 08)	-01.56 (N = 09)	-02.46 (N = 13)
Low	03.00 (N = 11)	02.00 (N = 08)	03.33 (N = 06)	05.57 (N = 07)
Total	-.88	-1.61	-.87	-.44

Total overall shift = -.92

TABLE 12

Average Shifts in the "Community vs Private Shelters" Statement Category for:
 + = change toward liking Community better
 - = change toward liking Private better

Did you receive a copy
of the bulletin?

If yes above, did you read it?

Initial Position	Mean			
	NO, NO	YES, NO	YES, YES IN PART	YES, YES
High	-02.92 (N = 13)	-00.80 (N = 10)	-01.67 (N = 09)	-01.00 (N = 07)
Medium	00.08 (N = 12)	01.20 (N = 05)	01.22 (N = 09)	00.78 (N = 09)
Low	01.13 (N = 08)	01.38 (N = 08)	04.50 (N = 04)	01.45 (N = 11)
Total	-.85	.39	.63	.59

Total overall shift = .102

TABLE 13

Average Shifts in the "Perceived Government Confusion on Civil Defense" Statement Category for:
 + = change toward more confusion
 - = change toward less confusion

Did you receive a copy
of the bulletin?

If yes above, did you read it?

Initial Position	Mean			
	NO, NO	YES, NO	YES, YES IN PART	YES YES
High	-00.70 (N = 10)	-01.44 (N = 09)	-01.67 (N = 09)	-03.40 (N = 05)
Medium	00.60 (N = 10)	-00.75 (N = 12)	-00.17 (N = 06)	-00.17 (N = 12)
Low	01.85 (N = 13)	02.50 (N = 07)	01.29 (N = 07)	02.40 (N = 10)
Total	.70	-.74	-.32	.18

Total overall shift = .037